DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 965 JC 900 460

AUTHOR Gulassa, Cy
TITLE Collaborative Governance in the Foothill/De Anza Community College District. Management Report, 1988-89/3.
INSTITUTION Association of California Community Coll. Administrators.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Collective Bargaining; *College Administration; *College Governing Councils; *Collegiality; *Community Colleges; Faculty College Relationship; Labor Relations; Multicampus Districts; Organizational Development; *Participative Decision Making; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Foothill De Anza Community College District CA

ABSTRACT

A move from "participative" to "shared" governance of the California community colleges is one of the fundamental goals of Assembly Bill 1725. The Foothill-De Anza Community College District has given special priority to meeting this goal through its system of shared governance. Foothill-De Anza's success can be attributed to the climate for excellence created by the college's collaborative governance body, the District Budget and Policy Development Group (BPDG). The group includes representatives from the student body, faculty union, minority staff association, directors of human resources and plant services, as well as college presidents, deans, and senate representatives. The District Chancellor acts as referee. Decisions are arrived at collaboratively, and each member's presence and input is required at all meetings. Idea integration is used as the primary means of dealing with intragroup conflict. While the Chancellor and management retain the administrative power, the emphasis is on consensus building and mutual respect for all interests represented. The quality of the BPDG's decisions and the resulting sense of trust convinced union leaders that BPDG actually improved rather than restricted bargaining activities. (GFW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322965

Management Report

1988-89/3

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN THE FOOTHILL/DE ANZA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

by

Cy Gulassa
Vice President
Foothill/De Anza Faculty Association

JC 900460

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Gulassa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACCCA Your Professional Association

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Association of California Community College Administrators

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

The advent of AB1725 has commanded the attention of California community colleges this past year and focused it on a number of aspects of our operations but none more fundamental than governance. Indeed, as a result of all this attention, "shared governance" has begun to replace "participatory governance" in our current lexicon. This movement is more than a matter of semantics, more than the replacement of one term with another. It represents a substantive shift from a governance model in which all the constituents have a right to participate -- that is, to influence decisions that will affect them, to one in which these same parties have a right to collaborate in making those decisions.

As idealistic -- and, therefore, unrealistic -- as this development may seem to some of us, the balance may come back to our perspective when we realize that there are districts in which shared governance has been in place and functioning for some time. One of these, the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, is the subject of this paper. Its well-established and fully developed system of shared governance is presented here not so much as a model for emulation but rather a major factor in the more recent successes of the District and its colleges. It provides a clear and compelling example of how the idealistic concept of shared governance can in fact become a reality, and how, once having done so, it can not only contribute to operational decisions but to the policy decisions that in turn shape the future of our colleges. This Management Report re-examines some key premises and principles of leadership, outlines the background and development of the Foothill-De Anza structure and system, and considers its implications for collective bargaining and the shifting/expanding base of power in college governance. Finally, it comes to some conclusions about the overall effect of this model on these two colleges and their district, and its implications for other institutions faced with implementing AB1725.

Appropriately enough, this paper was written not by an administrator but by a faculty member. It was done in consultation with District Chancellor Thomas W. Fryer, Jr., former Vice Chancellor and District Counsel Peter Landsberger, Acting Division Dean Margaret Thompson (De Anza College), Faculty Association President Peggy More, and Education Profession Richard Axen (CSU, San Francisco), all of whom reviewed early drafts and made valuable recommendations. In addition, the author interviewed past and present members of the Foothill-De Anza collaborative decision-making group from all segments.

Cyril ("Cy") Gulassa, a De Anza College English instructor, is the current Vice President and past President of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), a statewide professional association responsible for assisting in the development and advocacy of annual legislative proposals on professional and academic issues. He is also Vice-President and past President of the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association, an independent collective bargaining unit serving 2,000 full- and part-time instructors. He is co-founder and past President of the Bay Faculty Association (BFA), a consortium

of faculty organizations of the ten San Francisco Bay community colleges, and co-founder and current Director of California Community Colleges Independents (CCCI), a statewide consortium of independent collective bargaining associations. Through all of these state, regional, and local activities, he has had extensive experience in governance and collaborative decision-making. For ACCCA members, his name may be most closely associated with his leadership role in the design and development of AB1725, specifically those portions related to faculty/administrator qualifications, hiring, evaluation, and retention. On March 10, 1987, the State Assembly passed a resolution honoring him for distinguished service in the cause of higher education in California.

Ray Liedlich
Columbia College
Editor, ACCCA
Management Reports

Editorial Review Board

Jack Bessire
Monterey Peninsula College

Ione Elioff
Solano Community College

Bill Vega
Coastline Community College

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN THE FOOTHILL/DE ANZA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

By Cy Gulassa, Vice President
Foothill De Anza Faculty Association

By any definition, Foothill De Anza is today one of the most successful community college districts in California. In teaching load, its faculty outstrip all others; the average instructor generates 595.5 student contact hours per week, 114.5 more than the state average. Translated into dollars, this above average productivity wrought an extra $12,316,863 for the district in 1986-87. When adjusted for the above average salaries Foothill De Anza faculty earn, the net gain for the district was $10 million.

While some districts struggle to fill classrooms, DeAnza college now serves more than 27,000 students and vies for standing as the largest community college in the world. Its participation rate, the number of students it attracts from its community base, is 300 percent above the norm and wins the distinction of being the highest in California, perhaps in the nation.

If a high degree of community support and good relations among trustees, managers and staff are a sign of institutional well being, then the District is surely one of the healthiest. In spite of four arbitrations last year and a part-time Peralta suit a few years ago that netted 13 faculty nearly a quarter of million in backpay, relations to this day remain cordial, salaries and benefits are among the top ten, and union and management until recently even shared the same financial consultant.

Explanations of the cause of Foothill-DeAnza's phenomenal success vary, of course, depending on the individuals asked. One explanation assumed by some to be true is that the district simply has a lot of money. In fact, Foothill/De Anza's revenue per student remains well <u>below</u> the state average. Other explanations often given include excellent leadership, good planning, ideal location, committed staff, innovative teaching, comprehensive programs, and excellent public relations. Obviously all of these contribute to institutional success, but one ingredient frequently cited as creating the climate for excellence is the philosophy of collaborative governance best exemplified by the District Budget and Policy Development Group (BPDG).

Pioneered in the early 80's, the BPDG is a system for partnership in decision making that guarantees all segments a direct voice in

the development of the nearly $100 million District budget and all related district-wide policies that flow from budgetary decisions. Since shared governance is a relatively new phenomenon in community colleges, and in response to AB1725, many districts are developing new forms of participatory governance, it may be instructive to take a closer look at the Foothill-DeAnza model.

Premises of Leadership

Unlike Athene, the Foothill-DeAnza BPDG did not spring whole from the head of District Chancellor Thomas W. Fryer. His concept of governance is the result of a long incubation of some of the basic premises of leadership, heated by a series of faculty-management confrontations during the late seventies, and tempered by personal experiences at institutions like Miami-Dade, Chabot, Peralta, and Foothill-DeAnza. Successful leadership, Fryer said an his opening statement to a 1985 BPDG Retreat, the kind that transforms and inspires others to outperform themselves, is determined principally by the decision-making style of the chief executive officer and presidents.[1] For Example, the time, place, and manner of deciding to cut back one program and expand another or hire one individual instead of another not only affect the climate of an institution but the very quality of life of its members. If faculty and staff share in the decision-making process, they feel empowered and experience a sense of ownership and personal responsibility. The feeling that one has a stake in the enterprise ultimately helps give work its meaning and forms the philosophical basis of Foothill-De Anza's much discussed superordinate goal: "to create two fully functioning community colleges, as teaching, learning and service communities, for whose members work is joy." There are some who question whether any institution or profession or individual could stimulate such profound job satisfaction, but few dispute the worthiness of the goal.

Another tenet of Fryer's leadership philosophy holds that faculty and staff must be regarded as both means and ends. Unquestionably the primary function of an educational institution is to educate the students, and every employee performs a discrete function that serves as a means to that end. But few educational leaders realize, as author Alexander Astin points out in Achieving Educational Excellence, that the truly excellent educational institution must also serve its staff. The more a college invests in the intellectual and scholarly development of its

---

1. The outline of the Chancellor's leadership principles that follows (pp. 3-5) is derived from Thomas W. Fryer, Jr., "The BPDG and the Fully Functioning Community College, for Whose Members Work Is Joy," December 30, 1985, in Foothill-DeAnza Papers, 1986, pp. 45-74.

faculty the greater the difference in the meaning of life and professional work and the greater the success with students. This idea of dual talent development for students and staff, is a better measure of success than traditional report card criteria, such as per capita expenditures and institutional status. The Foothill-De Anza District, therefore, places great emphasis on professional growth and recognizes that sharing in local or state community college governance provides a unique opportunity for personal development.

Principles of Governance: Collaboration, Verticality, Visibility

The application of principles like "responsibility through ownership," "empowerment through decision-making," and "employees as ends" requires substantial changes in traditional governance models. Minor tinkering will not suffice. To foster in all of its members a sense of empowerment and equal partnership in the governance of the District, the Foothill/De Anza BPDG is vertically structured and uses a collaborative style of decision-making. As of the 1988/89 academic year, the 24 members include:

1. District Chancellor (1)
2. District Finance Officer (1)
3. District Counsel (1)
4. Dir. Human Resources (1)
5. Dir. Plant Services (1)
6. College Presidents (2)
7. College Student Reps (2)
8. College Managers (2)
9. College Deans (2)
10. College Senates (2)
11. Faculty union (3)
12. CSEA Units A&B (4)
13. Minority Staff Assoc. (1)
14. Administration Assoc. (1)

All members from Chancellor to students are seated at the Board room table at the same time and all engage in a discussion/debate that assures a clear understanding of the problems, explores different options and generally leads to modified consensus. Thus the entire hierarchy simultaneously collaborates in the end product- the decision or board recommendation. This process is quite distinct from vertically organized consultation wherein each segment at different times and independent of each other gives advice to the CEO who later in private either alone or with a few top managers, makes his or her final decision. The latter type of decision-making cannot reflect the advice of all segments because the recommendations generally originate in mutually conflicting organizational interests rather than overarching institutional goals. Left with conflicting recommendations, the CEO will be most disposed to adopt those that reflect his/her own views.

In addition to verticality and collaboration, the BPDG stresses visibility. At "any point where the decision-making process stream flows underground, out of the view of the other parties, bad things begin to happen," writes Chancellor Fryer, and these bad things include cynicism, paranoia and distrustfulness. In the BPDG, all decisions are made at the table, in full view of all

participants. Everyone not only understands how decisions are made, they witness how and what others think and perceive underlying values, which leads to mutual respect and to a degree, even affection.

Idea Integration

According to Charles Broaded there are five ways to deal with conflict- a)indecision, b)appeasement, c)force, d)compromise, and f)idea integration. Idea integration means that at some level, the interests of all parties merge. At the level of the constituency organization, defensive strategies dominate, e.g., preservation of the organizational entity and protection of the interests of members. The more management and union view each other as competitors for coveted power and resources, the greater the need for strong unions and an equally strong management class. But if the players can be persuaded to see beyond the horizons of their own organizational interests to the needs of the institution as a whole- idea integration- then all sides profit. The welfare of each discrete organization is biologically dependent on the health of the host institution. Idea integration is the dynamic that drives consensus building in the BPDG.

Scope of BPDG

The charge of the BPDG is to develop recommendations to the Board of Trustees concerning the district budget and important related policies including long-range planning for human resources, information systems and new construction, among others. Agenda items range from layoffs to new hires, from affirmative action goals to new telephone systems, from salary to leasing out a soccer field or building a multi-level parking lot. Matters that pertain to individual campuses- budget allocations, the mix of programs, purchase of equipment- are decided at the campus level in BPDGs modeled after the district group.

Fryer's operating rule is this: if the matter is something that he has the authority to decide on his own, he decides in the room with the BPDG. If it is something that the Board of Trustees is to decide, he formulates his recommendation to the Board in the room with the BPDG. In essence the BPDG is the Chancellor's Cabinet, since Fryer has no other group he uses for decision-making purposes.

Fryer conceives the leadership team of Foothill/De Anza to begin at the Board of Trustees and to include the entire BPDG. Important issues that arise in the District, in Sacramento and elsewhere thus involve all constituent groups, and their involvement and participation as district leaders and representatives is expected and encouraged.

BPDG Protocol

The BPDG process is governed by several important rules:[2] 1)Attendance is mandatory; members are expected to give top priority to BPDG meetings, which are usually held Friday afternoons, and substitutes are not permitted. 2)All members have equal access to the same information which, to the extent practical, consists of primary documents as well as digests and analyses. 3)Agenda items may be submitted by any member, but each item must be accompanied by a summary, an estimate of the time required to discuss the issue, supporting documents and a recommendation for action. 4)All major District-level issues, excluding personnel and similar confidential matters, must funnel through the group. No "end runs" or surprises are permissible. 5)Silence is unacceptable; all members are expected to engage in discussion as appropriate and express judgment on all controversial issues. 6)Decisions made within the group, subject to approval by the trustees, are binding unless subsequently modified in the group.

To contain disruptive controversy, comments made by individuals during a BPDG meeting are considered confidential and may not be attributed without permission. If public debate is required, however, all parties are obliged to address the issues and refrain from personality attacks and propaganda.

Pre-BPDG Meetings

Before a BPDG meeting, the agenda and supporting materials are distributed to all members. Unions, senates and classified staff regularly hold joint pre-BPDG meetings, generally conducted by the chief negotiator or budget analyst, to review the agenda and develop faculty/staff consensus. Initially there was concern that these meetings would encourage "bottom line" proposals and a "solid front." But participants now believe that these pre-meetings are more like study sessions that help assure thorough preparation, especially of complex financial issues, and speed resolution.

BPDG Procedures and Process

At the beginning or each meeting, the Chancellor who acts as chair, prioritizes the agenda by consensus, adds new items, and members share pertinent, late-breaking news. Then each agenda item is presented by its author who provides the history, rationale and action desired. The Chancellor acts as referee, takes the official minutes, and at the conclusion of each item he

---

2. The BPDG has no written constitution, bylaws or procedures. Existing practices have been adopted by consensus over a period of time and are subject to modification.

often reads aloud his written summary of the discussion and recommendations. These hand-written notes become the official minutes and are distributed to all members, all administrators in the district, other key people, as well as the local board.

Sometimes a consensus is reached immediately, for example, on a proposal to hire a consultant to evaluate a supplemental retirement plan. Other issues may stimulate debate that spans several meetings and may even spill into the board room for a final decision by trustees. One such case was a proposal to form a joint powers agreement with the city for an on-campus police department. Aside from the pros and cons of armed police on a suburban campus, the issue excited attention because it was a test case, the first instance of a major proposal brought before the trustees without an adequate hearing first in the BPDG. The trustees referred the issue back to the BPDG for further discussion and a recommendation, which is still pending, and Fryer acknowledged that he had made a mistake by not going to the Board first.

Modified Consensus

Prior to making a decision on controversial issues, the Chancellor polls all members, partly to assess consensus, partly to assure engagement and establish the public record. The climate is non-coercive, but nevertheless participants are encouraged to express their personal and organizational views rather than remain silent which sometimes may be a substitute for dissent. Although consensus heavily influences the decisions, the Chancellor as pointed out above assumes responsibility for and reserves the right to make the final recommendation in the BPDG. Indeed, on one occasion in spite of overwhelming opposition, the Chancellor decided to fund a High-tech Humanities program on a one-year trial basis. But these unilateral decisions are rare and are made for compelling, clearly articulated reasons. One may disapprove of such a decision, but will always understand the considerations that led to it and the rationale supporting it.

Commenting on this modified form of consensus before the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the union president said: "Faculty have no illusions- management clearly retains the edge of power- the chancellor can veto any proposal and in that way the local board preserves its authority. What is remarkable about the system [BPDG] is that both sides have a chance to debate, come to consensus on what the budget facts and goals are. Out of that expanded knowledge comes mature responsibility and commitment."[3]

---

3. Cy Gulassa, "Statement to Joint Commission for the Review of the Master Plan," October 22, 1985, p. 8, reprinted in Foothill-DeAnza Papers, p 40.

BPDG and Collective Bargaining

When the BPDG was officially formed, the District had just concluded a bitter two-year struggle with the union that included mediation, fact finding, and faculty rejection of unilaterally imposed terms and conditions of employment.[4] The Union newsletter had regularly vilified management and accused it of hiding funds and distorting ending balances. Not surprisingly, the first exploratory phase of the BPDG was politically tense and communication often degenerated into soap-box oratory, especially since state funding was inadequate and the budget required cutbacks.

At the same time, there was serious concern about the impact of BPDG activities on collective bargaining. Some negotiators were upset about the apparent violation of laws that prohibited substantive debate of negotiable items in any official forum except the table itself. Public debate of issues could force negotiators into premature positions and rob the process of its flexibility. But even worse, there was fear that by deciding the big financial items, BPDG would destroy the effectiveness of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is a science that requires discipline and skill, they argued. Money is central to its efficient working because it generates powerful internal pressures and accelerates completion of the entire package through facilitation of tradeoffs in areas where participants have little incentive to move. As one union negotiator put it, "If BPDG decides the compensation pot and determines policy, then the professional negotiation teams have been demoted to custodians, sweeping up after a big game played by others."

But as experience accumulated and the quality of the decisions became evident, union leaders eventually concluded that the BPDG actually improved rather than restricted negotiations. Since the union President, chief negotiator and budget analyst were members of the Group, had direct access to administrative data, and could routinely speak to the Chancellor instead of through his subordinates, they realized they had more accurate data and considerably more influence than the traditional mode provided. An examination of the figures proved that budget problems were real, and one year when an extra $800,000 surfaced over night, everyone agreed it was an oversight rather than an attempt to

---

4. For a detailed history of labor relations in the Foothill-DeAnza District, see CSU San Francisco Professor Richard Axen's work in progress, "A Case Study of Collective Bargaining in Foothill DeAnza." See also Margaret R. Thompson, "Collective Negotiations at Foothill-Deanza, 1977-1982," Mutual Gains Bargaining in the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, De Anza College, 1987, pp. 27-32.

hide money. During development of the budget, management showed good faith by setting aside among the initial allocations of funds as first priority a tentative 5 percent salary pot, thereby breaking the tradition of considering salary as a footnote after the rest of the budget had been written.

Events like these laid the strong foundations of trust necessary to make a system of shared governance work. At one point, the union realized that the outstanding productivity of District faculty, frequently the top in the state, was directly attributable to participation in shared governance and should be used as a rationale for a modest increase in compensation. The argument carried. As De Anza President Robert DeHart stated, "Faculty leaders who understand the views and vocabulary of management speak more persuasively to the Board than those who see only their own side." Shared responsibility for productivity meant sharing the fruits thereof.

Management Response to BPDG

Union leaders were not the only ones who had initial reservations about BPDG. One of management's first complaints concerned the slow pace of decision making. Whereas previously the Chancellor's cabinet could in an hour or two dispose of a long agenda without extensive debate, the BPDG demanded clear rationales and reliable data to persuade other groups to "buy in." Further, managerial "entrepreneurship" of the kind that introduced significant innovations in technological programs, educational delivery systems, and business alliances seemed mired in lengthy discussions that some likened to filibuster. The Faculty was not opposed to innovation, but it frequently questioned the implications of experimental proposals and warned about the danger of "soft" ADA, the kind that might be disfunded by the state Chancellor's office. Top managers, accustomed to acting independently and taking creative risks, wondered aloud if the BPDG produced "the best possible recommendations or merely the lowest common denominator of group consensus?"

In addition to these constraints on management's traditional style of decision-making, the BPDG process was initially more "political" than any previous type of governance. No longer did managers enjoy the anonymity and protection that traditional "closed door" meetings afforded. Those who would argue for unpopular causes had to be prepared to be challenged publicly.

But just as with faculty, management reservations about the BPDG process gradually diminished. "Sunshining" proposals did slow progress, but it allowed time for refinements and building consensus and a team spirit. When the governor slashed revenues and demanded tuition and reform, both sides joined in writing a survival budget that subordinated short-term organizational gains to long-term institutional goals. Unlike many districts, the

BPDG preserved programs and kept the campuses well-groomed, but limited compensation and imposed severe freezes on hiring and spending. The District's celebrated recovery from the state-imposed financial drought with buildings, programs, morale and student body intact is attributed to collaborative decisions like these. Even with all of its limitations, the BPDG proved a powerful instrument for economic survival.

"Nifty Nine" Restores Managerial Power

Even though the BPDG demonstrated that all segments could work well together, especially in times of economic hardship, top-level managers sensed a loss of power and concluded that the Chancellor had gone too far. To guarantee that the BPDG would be an "open" forum where a free dialectic would take place, he had abolished his "Chancellor's Cabinet" and declined to meet in advance of BPDG meetings with his top managers. Sudden exclusion from what was once the most influential body in the District led managers to believe that the balance of power had shifted toward faculty. In effect, the BPDG had become a giant "Chancellor's Cabinet" where faculty had equal status with managers and had a "jump" on the issues because they held pre-BPDG meetings to develop tentative consensus. When asked who were the most powerful leaders in the District, managers were apt to reply, "the chancellor and the union president."

To restore the balance of power, top management formed a coalition of its own, the "Nifty Nine" - the two college presidents, vice chancellor, and three top deans from each campus- which met in advance of BPDG meetings just as faculty and classified did to analyze the the agenda and formulate its own consensus. At times the Chancellor meets with this group but generally refrains from making decisions or developing consensus on BPDG items.

On one recent occasion, however, he did make a decision which inadvertently penalized certain faculty who elected to take sabbaticals in quarterly installments distributed over several years. When the chief negotiator protested the decision, the Chancellor promptly reversed himself, acknowledging that he had violated his own BPDG principle of "verticality" which requires that representatives from all segments be present when decisions are made, and "visibility" which means all decisions must be made in a public forum. "If I had heard the union negotiator's views in the first place, I would never have made that recommendation," the Chancellor observed. "It reaffirms for me the validity of the BPDG process."

There is now consensus that management and staff "pre-BPDG" meetings tend to streamline BPDG deliberations- it takes less time for members to understand the issues, adopt a position and achieve group consensus.

Middle-Management Bid for BPDG Power

While the "Nifty Nine" resolved some of the misgivings of top-level managers, it did little to assuage the powerlessness felt by division deans. They had to deal with faculty concern over program changes and equipment shortages, yet had no input in the budget decisions made "on high" in the BPDG. Determined to share in "shared governance," they began along with the Minority Staff Association an intensive lobbying effort that eventually won both of them BPDG billets. A few months latter, a newly seated dean concluded: "Our presence there does not significantly alter the kind of decisions made, but it makes it easier for us to understand and support those decisions. If you're a member of the team, the plays and the score make a lot more sense."

Maturation of BPDG

As the BPDG evolved, the trust, commitment and vision of its members matured and fears of "caving in" or "giving away the store" or "being co-opted" disappeared. After group analysis of a problem, it became easier to understand the complexity of issues, distinguish between organizational and institutional interests, and make the kind of decisions that fostered commitment and a sense of ownership. At some point true "idea integration" occurred: "mine" and "yours" merged into "ours." At the end the first year of participation, "The President's Message" in the Faculty Association News concluded:

> But all in all, [the faculty union's] consensus is that participation in BDG[5] was worth the price. It provided a creative, flexible alternative to the old system. (Remember, just a little over a year ago, a majority of faculty were ready to invoke sanctions and morale had plunged to an all-time, destructive low.) And by diminishing concern for prerogative and power, BDG fostered partnership and tentative return to collegiality. The ultimate test of any process is the product. In this case, the settlement amply justifies the BDG means. Even though the future may be mined with financial disasters and disruptive shifts in leadership and philosophy, the BDG experiment is worth at least one more try.[6]

Management also expressed strong support. One Foothill dean,

---

5. The original title of the BPDG was Budget Development Group (BDG). This was later changed to the Budget Policy and Development Group to reflect the expanding role of the body.

6. Cy Gulassa, "Budget Development- A Post Mortem," FA News, September 20, 1982, p. 4.

originally critical of the BPDG as too time consuming, recently stated, "My old complaint about the slow pace of decision-making is no longer valid. The members are more seasoned, more aware of each other's concerns, more informed, and the process is exposed to sunlight. I might disagree about some decisions, but never the process."

The local Board, whose meetings in the past were often subjected to disruptive protests, also noted the return to collegiality: "Recent negotiations with the Faculty Association have been cooperative rather than adversarial and the entire ambiance of the collegiality that previously existed on these campuses has returned."[7]

Mutual Gains Bargaining

The fact that the BPDG functions as a quasi negotiations body made possible a revolutionary change in negotiation style. As shared information, open discussion and access to leaders smoothed relations and enhanced results, negotiations shifted from "positional" to "mutual gains" bargaining.[8] Positional bargaining is often characterized by "bottom line" demands, adversarial relations and, frequently, win-lose strategies. A basic premise is that because there is a fundamental and irreconciable separation between management and labor, organizational pride and self interest are pre-eminent. Resources are considered finite and divisible, and when one side profits the other literally loses. The vocabulary is replete with words like "demand," "concession," "confrontation," "sell out," "take backs," and positions often become personalized and rigidify into absolutes.

Mutual gains bargaining, on the other hand, views negotiations proposals as problems to be solved to the advantage of all participants. Avoiding "bottom lines," and separating people from issues, it explores organizational motives and values in order to determine shared interests. Once the area of goal convergence or

---

7. Gerald Besson, M.D., "Introductory Comments on the Budget Policy and Development Group," March 11, 1986, in Foothill-DeAnza Papers, 1986, p. 93.

8. For a detailed discussion of "mutual gains" bargaining," see Roger Fisher and William Ury, Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In, 1981; and Robert Birnbaum, Creative Academic Bargaining, 1980. Also useful is Herb Cohen, You Can Negotiate Anything, 1981. For a detailed analysis of mutual gains bargaining in Foothill-DeAnza, see Margaret R. Thompson, Mutual Gains Bargaining in the Foothill-De Anza Community College District: Collaborative Employer-Employee Relations in a High Commitment Work System, De Anza College, 1987.

"idea integration" is discovered, a variety of options can be generated that represent gains for everyone. For example, the union's goal of increasing "super maximums" on its salary schedule in its Professional Growth Award program was paired with management's need to build into it stronger growth and service incentives and better evaluation methods. What was once a small but almost automatic "longevity" bonus became a substantial award for genuine professional achievement that includes participation in all forms of governance whether local or state, academic or professional, senate or union. The result has been a surge of interest in committee service, especially since the BPDG proved that faculty enjoyed <u>real</u> rather than symbolic power in decision making.

In another instance, the union argued for more release time to enable its staff to participate in the District BPDG and the newly formed campus BPDGs. Although not opposed to to the request, the Board demanded guarantees that the extra release time would indeed be used for activities related to shared governance. The win-win compromise allocated an additional FTE release time provided the Board retained veto power over how 50 percent of that additional time would be used.

In the pre BPDG era, current plans for construction of a new technology center on the De Anza campus would have encountered strong resistance and stirred old rivalries between advocates of the humanities and sciences. But after several years of incubation both on campus and in BPDG and an analysis of community need, curriculum balance, the allocation of space, financing, and projected revenue; the institutional value as well as mutual benefit of the project became clearer and all segments "bought in."

To facilitate mutual gains bargaining, the BPDG often forms special committees to explore critical issues and propose a variety of win-win recommendations. Because the BPDG membership is comprehensive and inclusive, different segments learn to work cooperatively, without the traditional rivalries and mutual suspicions. Subgroups, such as a benefits committee, regularly review options and report to the BPDG. Decisions included changing the company that managed the District's self-insured medical benefits program and tightening benefits regulations, decisions, which, without the support of faculty and staff, would have been difficult to sell.

<u>BPDG and Productivity</u>

Productivity is a suspect word for many faculty. To some it means chasing ADA, jamming ever more students into over- crowded classrooms, increasing loads, and assigning top priority to programs that attract students and produce "income," regardless of academic merit. These fears are sometimes justified. Recently

a southern district in a bid to improve productivity, increased class sizes without fully consulting with the unions. The results were predictable- charges of bad faith, the filing of an unfair practice charge with Public Employees Relation Board (PERB), a sharp decrease in morale, and lingering resentment.

Although class sizes are not set in BPDG, shared governance creates the climate for cooperative, win-win solutions to productivity issues. Once members develop a sophisticated awareness of the way the colleges are financed and the tradeoffs necessary to preserve quality while increasing quantity, they often agree to support programs they traditionally oppose. Faculty no longer question the purpose of utilizing non-traditional delivery systems like contract instruction or cable or closed circuit television, as long as the "extra" revenue is used to support traditional programs. To increase productivity, large classes called "mega classes" (200 to 500 students) are agreed to only when the discipline lends itself to such a format (history and humanities), instructors are willing, and the extra revenue generated is used to support small classes, especially those sophomore level courses that traditionally attract fewer students but are essential components of the program.

Some areas like English composition will never be as "productive" as others like business or sociology, but it is certainly possible to increase productivity in a way that actually benefits both faculty and students. At Foothill, for example, faculty volunteer to convert several office hours per week to staffing the writing laboratory. There they meet with their own students as well as others who sign up for the lab, and help them with writing assignments. This is a classic win-win solution- the load remains the same, the department collects more ADA and the students profit. In a similar way, a placement test at De Anza that screens students according to skills levels makes it easier to teach classes, improves retention rates, and increases the need for more remedial classes where the students stand a better chance to succeed. Here quality, quantity and student need all merge.

Local Trustee Evaluation of BPDG

Although the BPDG restored collegiality and increased productivity, Board members called for a thorough evaluation of the new process. Did the fact that faculty members assumed quasi-managerial status and participate directly in the development of the budget actually weaken the authority of the board and the administration and inhibit decision making? Since the BPDG expresses the will of all employees, does it "box in" the board and politically compel it to approve recommendations? Trustee Dr. Gerald Besson's comments reflected the general feeling of fellow board members:

> . . . I do not see it [BPDG] as impinging on the authority of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Presidents or the Deans. On the contrary, I believe it is complementary to all these offices because it forces each participant to think and act like a trustee, a chancellor, a president, and a dean. In being given that surrogate authority, each participant must at the same time assume the heavy responsibilities for the difficult "buck stops here" decisions. To share rational yet intuitive and humane decision making is tremendously mutually supportive.
> . . . the final and most important point that all of us involved with the BPDG recognize is the existence of a district-wide superordinate interest that takes priority over all subordinate interests. We [the Board] are given an opportunity to use that overriding interest as a yardstick by which we may measure all of our decisions.[9]

The review was positive: the Board officially sanctioned the BPDG and commended the Chancellor for his achievement. In time, as pointed out above, mini-BPDGs were formed on each campus to develop college budgets and policies and eventually the principle of collaborative decision making spread throughout the district governance.

Cost of BPDG

What's the price tag of the BPDG? In very round numbers, each of the 22 members participates an average of 10 hours per month for 11 months of the year. At an average cost of $35 per hour for each member, the total cost in annual wages is about $85,000. Secretarial assistance and publication of agendas and packets probably add an additional $5000. For the most part, however, these costs are "paper" expenses; there is no actual increase in expenditures because all of these duties are performed as part of regular assignments. Further, the meetings are held on Friday afternoons, traditionally a time of few classes and low overall productivity. The only increase in fixed costs is the occasional hiring of substitutes for station employees; in addition, the faculty union compensates its representatives for summer work out of its own dues.

Any rigorous form of accounting would have to credit the "savings" generated by the displacement of established committees like the Chancellor's Cabinet and District Council, the general reduction in informational meetings, and the overall increase in productivity and morale.

---

9. Foothill-DeAnza Papers, p. 94.

Exportability of BPDG

Is the BPDG form of shared governance exportable to other districts or is it so rooted in personalities that no transplant is possible? Since its first began, with the exception of the Chancellor and one President, the players have changed in the Foothill-DeAnza BPDG- in some cases several times- with no apparent diminution of vitality and effectiveness. To be sure, the more confident and intelligent the leaders are, the better the system works. But no one individual is indispensable.

Rather than personality or a "personality cult," shared governance depends on the desire of district boards and CEOs to risk the experiment, and the willingness of faculty and staff to make it work. But change can be so threatening or the climate so inhospitable or the leadership so rigid that preservation of the status quo- no matter how bad- is mutually preferable. Fear and personal survival are stronger imperatives than reform. And in some cases complete deterioration of relations or a change in leadership may have to occur before the parties are ready for reconciliation and the adoption of new patterns of behavior.

AB1725 and Shared Governance

Local pressure for shared governance systems will increase as AB1725 mandates go into effect. This comprehensive community college reform bill passed by the Legislature last summer requires both the state and local boards to develop minimum standards "to ensure faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards."[10]

The bill further mandates that state Board of Governors "Develop policies and guidelines for strengthening the role of the academic senate with regard to the determination and administration of academic and professional standards, course approval and curricula, and other academic matters."[11]

Along with these broad directives, the bill specifically empowers local senates to develop jointly with their trustees local hiring qualifications, equivalencies for state minimum qualifications for hire and tenure, and fallback rights for non-tenured administrators seeking to return to the classroom. Unions are

---

10. Education Code, 70901(b)(1)(E); 70902(b)(7).

11. Sec.61(a), AB1725

also delegated new responsibilities, including negotiating peer evaluation procedures, Faculty Service Areas (FSAs), and competency standards, and consulting with local senates during the process. This is just a partial list of new duties that significantly empower faculty in the post reform era. Of note, the academic senates, previously entitled only to "meet and confer" with local boards and legally inferior to unions, will have significantly greater authority and a more secure place in the governance scheme. Guided by the increasingly powerful state Academic Senate, they can be expected to push hard for more power at the local level.

Conclusion

Fortunately shared governance today is not the daring experiment it was just a few years ago. The process and dynamics are defined, the advantages and disadvantages are clear, and numerous models are available for test drives. According to higher education researcher George Keller, who spoke March 7, 1989, at UC Berkeley on "Ten Trends in Higher Education," shared types of governance and general faculty empowerment are national phenomena. Apparently limited resources, shifting demographics and the changing needs of students require unprecedented involvement of all segments in the continuing quest for institutional excellence.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges OCT 05 1990